

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 11, 13 through 16, 18 through 21, and 23 through 31 are pending, with Claims 11, 16, 21, 26, and 27 being independent. Claims 11, 15, 16, 20, 21, and 25 through 29 have been amended.

Claims 11, 13 through 16, 18 through 21, 23 through 25, and 28 through 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 6,208,379 B1 (Oya, et al.) in view of US 2002/0175995 A1 (Sleeckx). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 11, 16, and 21 variously recite, *inter alia*, determining a time for dividing the moving picture data, *for generating plural moving picture* based on the information about the control of the camera which is taking the moving picture data.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Oya, et al. nor Sleeckx, even in the proposed combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed feature as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 11, 16, and 21.

Applicants respectfully submit that Oya, et al. merely discloses, e.g., that an image portion corresponding to the display-not-permitted area is made into a black image, so that the image portion corresponding to the display-not-permitted area is concealed (e.g., Fig. 34; col. 17, lines 21-31), while Sleeckx merely discloses, e.g., segmenting the video archive into one hour pieces (e.g., [0048]) which is not related to “the information about

the control of the camera...” as claimed; accordingly, even if they could be combined, *arguendo*, the combination would provide neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features.

Claims 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over newly-cited US 2004/0109071 A1 (Kido, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 26 and 27 recite, *inter alia*, determining a time for dividing the moving picture data, based on the information about the area which is prohibited from being displayed such that a first moving picture file based on a first moving picture data obtained in a period between a first time and a second time, a second moving picture file based on a second moving picture data obtained in a period between the second time and a third time, and a third moving picture file based on a third moving picture data obtained in a period between the third time and a fourth time are generated in a case that the first moving picture data does not include the area which is prohibited and the second moving picture data includes the area which is prohibited and the third moving picture data does not include the area which is prohibited.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Kido, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed feature as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 26 and 27.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kido, et al. discloses, e.g., that images GF and images GG are recorded as separate files MPF and MPG respectively, while GE may be further recorded (e.g., [0176]-[0178]); however, Applicants respectfully submit that

such provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 26 and 27.

Applicants also respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 11, 16, 21, 26, and 27.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. For example, Claims 15, 20, and 25 recite, *inter alia*, determining the time based on timing at which the change amount per unit time exceeds a predetermined change amount per unit time. And Claims 28 and 29 recite, *inter alia*, determining the time based on timing of controlling the camera toward a pre-set position. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied documents are silent at least as regards these features. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

#### REQUEST FOR ENTRY OF AMENDMENT

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the

Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/  
Daniel S. Glueck  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/jjr

FCBS\_WS 4242108v1